

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Subject	Project Evaluation Subcommittee Meeting #4 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	Date	May 18, 2021
Facilitator	Dr. Carl Hershner	Time	3:30pm – 5:00pm
Location	WebEx - https://governor.virginia.gov/i/zs92b	Scribe	Ashley Samonisky/Emily Sokol

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
Project Evaluation Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors			
1.	Dr. Carl Hershner – Chair	Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary	Y
2.	Kristin Owen – Vice Chair	Henrico County	Y
3.	Joshua Saks – Staff Advisor	Deputy Secretary of Natural Resources	Y
4.	Kevin DuBois	Navy Region Mid Atlantic Chesapeake Bay Program	Y
5.	Whitney Katchmark	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	
6.	Elain Meil	ANPDC	
7.	Keith Lockwood, Chief	United States Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y
8.	Catherine C. McGhee	Virginia Transportation Research Council	Y
9.	Dr. Karen McGlathery	Environmental Resilience Institute at the University of Virginia	
10.	Randy Owen	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	
11.	Ben Nettleton	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	Y
12.	Mary Carson Stiff	Wetlands Watch	Y
13.	William “Skip” Stiles, Jr.	Wetlands Watch	
14.	Erin Sutton	Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Y
15.	Dr. Robert S. Young	Western Carolina University	
16.	Kimberly Cain	Diversity Equity and Inclusion’s office	Y
Scheduled Speakers			
Designated Alternates			
Subcommittee Advisors			
17.	Shurui Zhang	Commonwealth Coastal and Marine Policy Fellow	Y
18.	Emily Steinhilber	EDF	Y
Other Participants			
19.	Ann Phillips	Rear Admiral, US Navy (Ret.) – Office of the Governor	Y
20.	Connor Winstead	DCR	Y
21.	Matt Dalon	DCR	Y
22.	Patrick Larsen		Y
23.	Wie Yusuf		Y
24.	Chris Stone		Y
25.	Grace Tucker		Y
Consultant Support			
26.	Ashley Samonisky	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y
27.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y
28.	Brian Batten	Dewberry	Y
29.	Dan Medina	Dewberry	Y
30.	Alaurah Moss	Dewberry	Y

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Introduction and Roll Call	<p>Dr. Carl Hershner welcomed everyone to the meeting and took roll and established a quorum. He asked attendees to ask questions using the chat box function. Dr. Hershner read the required Section 1289 language and asked for a motion to proceed with the meeting. Cathy McGee motioned, Mary Carson Stiff seconded. Motion Passed.</p> <p>If anyone has connectivity issues, they should contact Joshua Saks at 804-690-5673.</p>
2.	Dewberry Questions Discussion	<p>Dr. Hershner shared the responses recommended by the Subcommittee to the Dewberry Questions posed previously (See Attached Slides).</p> <p>Dr. Hershner asked whether there were any additional questions or comments. No further comments were raised by the Subcommittee or the Dewberry representatives.</p>
3.	PREP Tool Discussion	<p>Dr. Hershner shared the Subcommittee’s comments on the PREP tool, which was created and presented by the RAFT team (See Attached Slides).</p> <p>Dr. Hershner recognized that the Subcommittee’s comments have already been forwarded to the RAFT team to allow for an analysis and scoping of future iterations of the PREP tool. Dr. Hershner asked the Subcommittee whether there were any further comments or questions. No comments were raised by the Subcommittee.</p>
4.	VACMP Prioritization Framework	<p>Dr. Hershner explained that the main goal of this meeting was to provide the Subcommittee’s feedback on the VACMP Prioritization Framework previously presented by the Dewberry Team. Dr. Hershner invited Brian and Dan to provide rationale for the four proposed factors of the framework.</p> <p>Brian Batten (Dewberry) explained that the Team wanted to put forward a general framework that can be refined in the future as specific factors were determined to be appropriate. He acknowledged that there is further work needed to be done to better define categories in a way that promotes evaluation. Dan Medina (Dewberry) stressed the difficulty in finding a good compromise between covering the wide breadth of the master plan and also keeping the metrics reasonable. The four major factors identified in the framework are meant to house the eleven criteria.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner first established an overarching comment for his feedback, indicating that the Team did a reasonable job of capturing key elements from the Master Plan’s guiding principles. He stressed the importance of keeping these factors simple and clearly linking them to the Master Plan’s guiding principles, as there needs to be a clear message that these are the main goals that the program is focused on accomplishing so that they do not get lost throughout the project development process. Stressed the importance of clear communication. Dr. Hershner asked the Subcommittee if there were any comments about overall factors that should or should not have been included in the framework. The Subcommittee had no comments in this regard.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner then shared comments regarding the criteria attributed to each of the four factors, opening the floor for discussion for each criterion (See Attached Slides for criteria descriptions).</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Criteria 1A.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner believes that, to make this an implementable criterion, it must specify what sea level rise forecasts and time frame need to be used, so that relevant comparisons can be made. He also questioned whether there was intent to reference precipitation IDF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan- Yes, that is the overall intent. The framework will favor projects that are looking into these factors in order to obtain projects that are robust. We cannot predict how things will go, but by examining a wide number of possibilities based on different forecasts, you can have a more robust design that takes into account a greater variety of factors within the project. • Dr. Hershner- It is important to specify what sea level rise metrics are being used. • Kristin Owen- Reiterating Dr. Hershner’s opinion. If there is no standard that can be set regarding what sea level rise metrics are being used, then we at least need to be using criteria that the communities can rely on. There needs to be an established minimum requirement, or else we will not be able to compare the projects. <p>Chat Box Discussion Point – Mary Carson Stiff - I think providing a little guidance on what the word “sustainable” means would be helpful. Does a project just need to “look forward to” a future condition or does it need to survive the impacts of it?</p> <p>Discussion Point- Kevin DuBois - IDF curves are currently being updated. Referred to Ann for verification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear Admiral Ann Phillips- Yes, multiple IDF projects are currently in progress. One IEF modelling project focused on the Virginia coast is near completion and should, therefore, provide localities with a beneficial modeling resource. <p>Discussion Point- Brian- One possible system for ensuring standards are appropriately met could be based on a tiered ranking quality. If the community meets or exceeds the state’s standards or guidance, they receive the highest score. If the community does not meet the state’s standards but has identified methods of improvement, they would receive the middle score. And if the community in no way meets the standard, they would receive the lowest ranking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Hershner- If the state has made a specific recommendation, the ranking system is likely not a good idea. While the system could prove useful for IDF curves, the goal is to get everyone working with the same information and data. • Kristin- I think this method could work for some of the other, more subjective factors, such as community planning. • Dr. Hershner- Agreed. <p>Criteria 1B.</p> <p>Discussion Point – Dr. Hershner- Because there are not a wide variety of approaches being addressed in this criterion, it is important to clearly identify the approaches for both flood mitigation and natural resource enhancement.</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mary Carson- Agreed. <p>Criteria 2A</p> <p>Discussion Point – Dr. Hershner- It is important to establish and specify what risks are being considered (probabilities of occurrence), echoing the need for more specificity regarding the initial criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristin- Some communities within the coastal regions do not have tidal flooding or sea level rise issues. Could these criteria include other types of flooding that are not coastal? • Dr. Hershner- Precipitation-based flooding in the coastal zone is existent but may not be within the scope of this iteration of the framework. • Ann- Precipitation-based flooding is an area of interest within the context of this criteria, and we would like to do a more detailed analysis on compound flooding challenges subsequently. However, within the current time frame, there is limited opportunity to address compound flooding challenges in the initial cut of this plan. We do want to address it in the near future, though. <p>Discussion Point- Keith Lockwood- To appropriately measure the extended benefits, we need to go into more detail about the kind of coastal storms and numerous factors that influence this in future iterations. However, I am comfortable with the language of this criteria for the current iteration.</p> <p>Criteria 2B.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Kristin- Like has been stated for some of the previous criteria, there needs to be greater clarification. Planning looks different from community to community, so they need clearer guidance- set some standards or minimum criteria that must be met to direct communities in the planning process. What that looks like exactly, I am not sure. But we need to clarify in order to properly evaluate projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Hershner- Hopefully providing better clarification through this framework will motivate communities to prepare more well-rounded and improved projects. • Kristin- So one of the goals of the master plan is to steer communities towards creating more effective resiliency plans. <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner- I was under the impression that capacity building was one of the goals in this initial round of the master plan, so that people would be more capable of participating in future funding opportunities. If so, this should be on our minds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joshua Saks - The Community Flood Fund is designed to do many things, including fund capacity building for studies and projects. The master plan is being developed as a project-focused document. Capacity building is not addressed in this iteration of the master plan. • Dr. Hershner- Then people need to be aware of this difference. • Josh- This will be noted both in the grant manual and in the master plan. • Ann- There are many decisions that are still up in the air. We will have to wait until the completion of our risk assessment to understand the

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Commonwealth’s needs before these decisions can be made. We are not ruling anything out at this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh- But as of right now, the master plan is focused on flood-protection project-based plans. • Dr. Hershner- Based on the current criteria, this issue needs to be addressed with more specificity. Sorting out this issue will be important for those developing project proposals. • Dan- We are still defining the extent of benefits criteria and the extent to which it will be project-based and capacity-building. • Brian- The document does currently acknowledge that capacity-building projects will require a different set of metrics for evaluation. It would be challenging to impossible to evaluate them based on the same metrics. If there is a need to have a different set of criteria for these projects, then that will be addressed. However, this is all currently to be determined. <p>Criteria 2C.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner- Most localities do not currently have the planning criteria to evaluate what is critical infrastructure. You need to provide a mechanism by which localities can make these determinations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Sutton - Agreed. This could be a project in itself. Virginia Beach has workgroups to do this but gathering that kind of information would be a big undertaking. <p>Chat comment - from Kevin DuBois -The DoD has provided a list of all the military installations within Virginia along with the PDCs in which they fall. Tom Crabbs has that list.</p> <p>Criteria 2D.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Kevin - I was not sure if the term ‘flood protection’ in these criteria also includes surge protection, when thinking about the natural qualities. Does 2d include natural features such as dunes? You need to consider whether storm surge should be included in these criteria. Additionally, a sentence should be added to these criteria that includes the protection or enhancement of carbon sequestration mechanisms.</p> <p>Criteria 3A.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner- There needs to be a clearer definition of the terms “social” and “economic” equity for them to be universally understood. These terms are often defined differently by different organizations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin- The other side of this issue is that there are multiple different social vulnerability indices that can be used for measurement, and each prioritizes factors differently. There is equity information gathering being completed for all 133 jurisdictions; however, it recognizes these multiple indices. • Dan- We have identified and are evaluating a few equity indices. We are considering both sides of this issue and this variability.

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Hershner- It is also important to recognize the limitations of these indices when it comes to spatial resolution. This criterion is fine, as long as it recognizes that, in the context of equity, this is just a starting point and will require future refinement. Another focus for future iterations will be working with the localities to assess the effectiveness of using this funding source to address inequities throughout the state. • Kristin - I agree. The fact that these different data sets are not adjusted to the same scale must be addressed in future iterations. It is important to establish a standard for the data that is being used by the localities, as well as provide clear language in the criteria that specifies what documentation localities would need to prove that their data does not meet standards based on historical lack of representation in national datasets. • Kimberly Cain - Stressed the importance of further defining what social and economic inequities are. Additionally, it is vital that we look at local communities, particularly communities of color, to identify those that have previously not been included or in which have not been invested. <p>Chat Comment – Kevin Du Bois - I would want to make sure that DoD planning documents like Joint Land Use Studies, Compatibility Use Plans, and Military Installation Resilience Plans would be among those that would satisfy the 2.B requirement. Likewise, perhaps ACOE vulnerability assessments could also qualify.</p> <p>Chat Comment – Mary-Carson Stiff - Good point re: SOVI - I know the Master Plan does not need to match the CFPF, but the Fund Manual does reference the SOVI as it appears on the AdaptVA website. If continuity is a goal, matching it up might be helpful.</p> <p>Chat Comment – Kevin Du Bois - Integrated Vulnerability Assessment in the Chesapeake Bay Creating Priorities for Coastal Flooding Adaptation: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/24962/presentation- chloe_fleming.pdf and Identifying Coastal Vulnerabilities in Chesapeake Bay Communities: https://coastalscience.noaa.gov/news/identifying-coastal-vulnerabilities-chesapeake-bay-communities/</p> <p>Criteria 3B.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner- The criteria need to specify how high social vulnerability to coastal flood impacts is measured or determined. Additionally, it should specify a threshold of acceptable benefits.</p> <p>Criteria 4A.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner- How do you plan to determine whether a project is likely to secure funding for implementation? Also, it is important that flood risk mitigation be the primary criteria first and foremost, with implementability being a</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>secondary concern. That way, you will not degrade important projects that just are not yet ready for implementation, instead inspiring investment from other funding sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kevin- Is it valuable to recognize projects that leverage multiple sources of funding? Is this construed as a positive factor, rather than getting financing from one source? • Dr. Hershner- This is normally addressed in a cost-benefit analysis. • Josh- Questions regarding multiple sources of funding are generally addressed in the funding and grant division. The master plan should highlight the best and most important projects, allowing the funding process to continue separately, considering the various methods of funding available. • Ann- The Dewberry Team is currently evaluating how to effectively approach complicated, long-term projects that require various sources of funding. • Kristin- I agree with Josh. In terms of evaluation, it is also important to identify when groups have thought about potential sources of funding, rather than they have already secured funding. Similarly with capacity-building, as capacity does not need to be an in-house effort solely. If communities are consulting with an outside group, it should still be considered capacity-building, because not identifying this would be a disadvantage to small, rural communities that have a more limited staff. • Josh- It is in this situation where capacity can be approached from numerous perspectives. The goal of the master plan is to fund projects that build resiliency. Our main priority is identifying a method of determining what projects will provide the most help. • Kristin- Most of the time, localities are doing the bulk of project development on their own and then contracting out. Capacity also becomes a vital component when addressing the maintenance of projects long-term. It is important to recognize that capacity differs from project to project. <p>Criteria 4B and 4C.</p> <p>No additional comments on these criteria</p> <p>Concluding the discussion of each individual criteria, Dr. Hershner opened the floor to the Dewberry Team for any follow-up questions and comments, as well as for further direction from Ann regarding future discussion of this framework.</p> <p>Dan appreciated the Subcommittee for its feedback and the recognition that there is a spectrum of needs for individual projects. He identified that the question of projects' need for capacity will be given more thought by the Team.</p> <p>Brian elaborated that the next step of the process is to sit down with the Commonwealth team and determine the next level of specificity that is needed. They are still currently working through the initial process of sifting through different datasets, so it may take a few weeks to look at data outputs and determine how they will be applied in this process. He asked whether there will be any additional feedback provided in written format by the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee's feedback will be</p>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>taken into consideration to adjust, refine, and define the new iteration as things become clearer in the coming weeks.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner explained that the minutes from this meeting and the recording will likely fulfill feedback needs, as they had no additional feedback to offer currently. He emphasized that the main lesson from this meeting is that, when working with projects that are immediately useful, but you often do not have the time to make more sophisticated products, being clear and explicit is important. Dr. Hershner identified that the Subcommittee is accepting of the factors that have been identified, which is a reasonable starting point, except for the final implementability factor. The criteria associated with this factor are difficult to define but should be addressed in future iterations.</p>
5.	Public Comment Period	Dr. Hershner asked if any public attendees had comments. Josh advised there are no registered public speakers and there are no comments from the chat box.
6.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	<p>Kristin expressed concerns regarding messages in the chat that were not sent to all included attendees. Do these messages need to be read aloud to abide by FOIA standards? She resent them to all included attendees to ensure that they would be included in the final meeting recording. Ashley Samonisky (VPC) also incorporated all chat comments into the final meeting minutes as a formal record.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner announced that the next meeting would be the full TAC meeting on June 22nd. He expressed that any further comments for Dewberry on this topic should be sent to Brian Batten and Dan Medina, and should cc Ann Phillips and Matt Dalon.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner declared the meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.</p>

Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date
1.	Any further comments for Dewberry on the evaluation criteria should be sent to Brian Batten and Dan Medina, and should cc Ann Phillips and Matt Dalon.	All	TBD
2.			
3.			
4.			

If you have any questions, please contact Ashley Samonisky, Vision Planning and Consulting, at asamonisky@vision-pc.net.